

EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Fair Isaac Corporation, a)	
Delaware corporation,)	File No. 16-cv-1054
)	(DTS)
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Minneapolis, Minnesota
)	December 13, 2022
Federal Insurance Company, an)	3:56 p.m.
Indiana corporation, and ACE)	
American Insurance Company, a)	
Pennsylvania corporation,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAVID T. SCHULTZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MAGISTRATE JUDGE
(MOTION HEARING)

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff:

Merchant & Gould, PC
ALLEN W. HINDERAKER, ESQ.
MICHAEL A. ERBELE, ESQ.
PAIGE S. STRADLEY, ESQ.
HEATHER J. KLIEBENSTEIN, ESQ.
150 South Fifth Street
Suite 2200
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

For the Defendants:

O'Melveny & Myers, LLP
LEAH GODESKY, ESQ.
7 Times Square
New York, New York 10036

Fredrikson & Byron
TERRENCE J. FLEMING, ESQ.
RYAN C. YOUNG, ESQ.
200 South Sixth Street
Suite 4000
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

Court Reporter:

PAULA K. RICHTER, RMR-CRR-CRC
300 South Fourth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

Proceedings reported by certified stenographer;
transcript produced with computer.

1 We absolutely agree that defendants' total revenue
2 is relevant to FICO's pricing model, and so that will be
3 considered if the jury is evaluating fair market value,
4 actual damages. But it's a completely different thing to
5 say, as FICO does, that in order to determine fair market
6 value, the jury also needs to consider the specific profits
7 that defendants earned from use of Blaze. That's different.
8 That's a different inquiry. Not just total revenue of
9 defendants, but actually how many profits were defendants
10 earning from Blaze, and that's blurring the distinction
11 between fair market value and disgorgement damages.

12 THE COURT: But wait a second. How does that
13 advance your argument? They're saying when it comes to the
14 hypothetical negotiation, we get to tell the jury, you know,
15 the fact that they're a 13 billion or whatever dollar a year
16 organization is relevant to the license fee we would charge
17 and it's relevant to their expectation of the license fee
18 they would have to pay, so that figure -- that evidence
19 about just total revenue is coming in for that purpose.

20 And then on the disgorgement, 504(b) says you get
21 to dump it into evidence. You know, here's the 13 billion;
22 you sort out what's profit and what's related or not
23 related.

24 MS. GODESKY: Your Honor, there's a very
25 different -- it's very different for FICO to say -- present

1 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

2 Ms. Godesky.

3 MS. GODESKY: Godesky. May I make just four brief
4 points, Your Honor?

5 THE COURT: Yes. Godesky?

6 MS. GODESKY: Godesky, yes.

7 So four points, if I may. Number one, we agree
8 they have every right to try their case on actual damages.
9 They can put out their \$47 million figure and the evidence
10 that they say supports it. No one is talking about limiting
11 the evidence on that front. What we are talking about is
12 there's a separate issue with numbers that dwarf that \$47
13 million figure that the Court has decided the Court will not
14 even decide. And so the anchoring effect, the possibility
15 of split-the-baby considerations, right, all of those things
16 that are as old as time, and *Uniloc* is not the only case
17 that raises them, should absolutely factor into the decision
18 here.

19 Number two, I heard a lot of talk from counsel
20 about this concept of intrinsic value, and they spend a lot
21 of time in their papers talking about how the intrinsic
22 value of *Blaze* is relevant to the hypothetical negotiations
23 for the license fee, and I don't know where that came from.
24 There is no authority cited in their papers for this idea
25 that intrinsic value is relevant to calculating fair market